

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the telephone and personal interviews with Applicant's representative. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and interviews, and this response has been generated accordingly.

Claims 1–3, 5, 6, 8–10, and 12–16 remain in this application. Claims 2 and 5 have been indicated as being allowable if put into independent form.

Applicant notes that the finality of the Office Action of February 9, 2005 was withdrawn in the telephone interview of May 16, 2005 by the Examiner's supervisor after a petition was filed challenging the finality of that action.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8–10, and 12–16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leedom *et al.* (U.S. 6,389,143), in view of Husung (U.S. 5,809,151). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant conducted a personal interview with the Examiner in charge of this case on August 3, 2005. At that interview, it was pointed out that claim 1 recites a microphone encapsulated in an "electromagnetic shielding case," and an "analog/digital converter" which is "mounted on an outer surface of the electromagnetic shielding case." Claims 8 and 13 recite similar limitations. Claim 9 recites "an analog/digital converter mounted in such a manner that it is electromagnetically shielded from said microphone."

It was further discussed at the personal interview that the Examiner has admitted that neither of the cited references teaches an ADC (see the last full sentence of page 2 of the Office Action of February 9, 2005). Accordingly, none of the references can teach mounting an ADC on a shielding case, or electrically

shielding an ADC from a microphone. These are clear structural limitations that cannot be ignored. The Examiner admitted that this was a reasonable argument, and that the references do not teach an ADC mounted on a shielding case. Accordingly, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the rejections, and conduct a new search, and either issue a new rejection or allow the claims.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32396.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi – Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 9, 2005